



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee**
of the
Metropolitan Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized Area

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Louis Foster

Susan Kairalla

Christine Leduc

Amado Leon

Gabrielle Redfern

Claudia Schmid

Larry Thorson

Eric Tullberg

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator

davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW 1 Street, #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-1647

www.miamidade.gov/mpo



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

S.P. CLARK CENTER
111 NW 1 ST.
18TH FLOOR - CONFERENCE ROOM 3
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33128

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2006
AT 5:30 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF MAY 24, 2006
- III. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. KROME AV. PD&E – FDOT
 - B. ETHICS ADVISORY BOARD TRAINING – R. Thompson, M-DCE&PT
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. BPAC COMMUNITY WORKSHOP – D. Henderson
- V. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. BISCAYNE/EVERGLADES GREENWAY WORKSHOP – M-DP&R
 - B. LIVABLE COMMUNITIES WORKSHOP – FSU
 - C. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
 - D. MAY PROGRESS REPORT – J. Manzella
- VI. MEMBER COMMENTS

It is the policy of Miami Dade County to comply with all of the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The facility is accessible. For sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or materials in accessible format, please call 305-375-4507 at least five business days in advance.

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Bibeau
Sheila Boyce
Louis Foster
Susan Kairalla
Christine Leduc

Amado Leon
Gabrielle Redfern
Ted Silver
Larry Thorson
Eric Tullberg

MEMBERS ABSENT

Barry Burak
Claudia Schmid

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff
Jae Manzella, Staff
Jeff Cohen, MDPW
Robert Thompson, Comm. On Ethics
Julio Boucle, URS
John Hopkins, Bike Miami

The meeting began at 5:45 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	- ET: Requested to discuss trail maintenance this meeting. <i>SK: Motion to approve the revised Agenda; seconded by ET; vote – unanimous.</i>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- SB: Staff at the marina, not the restaurant, are telling cyclists to dismount. <i>Motion approving revised Minutes of 5/24/6 as amended; seconded by AL; vote – unanimous.</i>
KROME AV. PD&E UPDATE	- JB: This presentation regards the Krome Av. South project – SW 296 St. to SW 136 St. This 10-mile safety and capacity project has reached 60% design. A 17-member CAC reviewed the plans; and a public workshop was held on May 31 st . Some people do not see an advantage of a path next to the road. <i>He is asking for a resolution of support from the BPAC; as well as members to attend upcoming meetings to voice support.</i> This is a dangerous road. A few years ago, an Action Plan was developed, which kept the corridor two-laned; but, with paved shoulders, a multi-use path and an equestrian trail; some sections had passing lanes as well. A revised typical section called for 4 lanes and a median, keeping the path; but, omitting the trail. This was done because the road is part of the FDOT SIS roadway system; an important link in the intramodal system. The typical section was further refined to minimize ROW impacts, yet keep a 10' path. TS: Inquired as to specific objections people are making against a path. JB: They don't think anyone cycles in that area. SB: Inquired as to the benefit opponents would receive by removing the planned path. JB: Saving money; but, the cost of the path is miniscule compared to the overall project. TS: Inquired if opponents thought a path would eliminate existing or future parking, access, etc.; or, would bring a higher crime rate, or reduce property values. JB: None of these. More than 80% is agricultural land, so there are few driveways. Even if the path was removed, the required ROW remains the same because of drainage. GR: Unsure why the BPAC is concerned about opposition; the FDOT approved the path. TS: Previous projects have gone through the entire planning process and brought before the MPO Governing Board; at that time, opponents voiced objection to bikeways, and the MPO micromanaged/deleted those bikeways. Grand Av. and Sunset Dr. are two examples. For this controversy, only JB is speaking on behalf of keeping the path. Endorsing the FDOT's efforts helps build coordination. GR: There have been instances where the FDOT's efforts were in direct opposition to an overwhelming majority of residents; yet, they continued on. SK: By supporting this project, it lets opponents know that there are other people whom do cycle along this corridor; and more would, if a path is built. TS: This has been a controversial issue from inception. This is an example why someone

	<p>from the cycling community has to be present and vocal at every public meeting. JB: <i>The next CAC meeting will be sometime in September.</i> ET: <i>It should be pointed-out that this corridor is critical for state-touring cyclists to avoid most of the urban confusion; also, many cyclists travel to Homestead and the Everglades. Without a path, they will be riding dangerously close to semi-trucks.</i> GR: <i>Motion supporting FDOT's efforts and congratulating the south Miami-Dade community on their new, progressive greenway; seconded by SK; vote – unanimous.</i> DH: <i>Requested early notice on any more Krome Av. meetings.</i> TS: Officials from Homestead and Florida City have defeated efforts to continue the bikeway into their municipalities, via historic designation and logistical arguments. Although they suggested finding an alternative route, they did not provide suggestions or funding opportunities to do so. This issue still lingers. SK: Inquired how an equestrian trail differs from the typical section's open area. JB: Grading and providing a clear trail is important. Otherwise, drainage is a problem. SK: Apparently, the CAC does not represent equestrians or cyclists.</p>
ETHICS WORKSHOP	<p>- RT: As an advisory board, the BPAC is exempt from conflict of interest issues. A board gives citizens powers that can be abused. The COE takes a pro-active approach to avoid any abuses by conducting outreach workshops. Among the many issues the group should know: supplying campaign contributions to an elected official limit a person from receiving contracts for 1 year. The Sunshine Law applies to: appointed boards and their subcommittees; any discussion of public business, or any matter that will foreseeably come before the board for action; and staff members, depending on the nature of the actions they perform. Meetings subject to the Sunshine Law: (formal or informal) gatherings of two or more members of the same board; written communications, including e-mail circulated among members for comments – use staff to relay these. This also applies to: phone conversations, computer records, informal discussions/workshops; and meetings to discuss personnel matters. The implication is that issues will be discussed without properly informing the public, whether or not this actually occurs. However, if someone implies a violation of the law, but is unable to relay that actual conversation, there will not be a follow-up. There are 3 basic requirements: 1) meetings must be open to the public; 2) the public must receive reasonable notice of meetings; 3) minutes of the meetings must be taken and open to public inspection. Don't schedule meetings where there is an entrance/parking fee. Reasonable notice for emergency meetings is at least 24 hours in advance. Send press releases for matters of public concern; advertise in local newspapers. This aids with obtaining community consensus. The irony of inspection trips is: they are not prohibited, as long as discussions related to the business of the board are not discussed. Make notes, then discuss them at the next regular meeting. Excluding certain members of the public on trips is not allowed. GR: Essentially, field reviews have to be made by a single member each time. TS: This works against the reason for field reviews; it is impossible to take notes and have a meaningful discussion on minutiae later. RT: When in doubt, call the COE. BB: If the site visit is publicly noticed, members can discuss issues. RT: That is as long as the visit does not bar the public from participating. TS: It is too difficult to determine what will be on a future Agenda. RT: The public has the right to participate in meetings. Reasonable rules can limit the amount of time an individual may address the board, and the speaker is confined to agenda items. Abstaining from voting is not allowed by law, unless the member has or appears to have a conflict of interest. Members may absent themselves prior to a vote</p>

	<p>being taken, but this is discouraged, particularly if it results in the board losing a quorum.</p> <p>GR: The BPAC is exempt from conflict of interest.</p> <p>RT: True; so, try to vote either way.</p> <p>TS: Under the impression that a quorum is implied until it has been questioned.</p> <p>RT: Not true under Florida law. Also, if a member thinks that the manner a presentation or discussion is made, s/he may request the issue be brought before the committee again. Do not become hostile in discussions, or in exchanges with the public outside of the meetings. Regarding public records; all e-mails become public records. Computers & PDA's with committee information may be open to inspection; personnel records (e.g., medical records, social security numbers are exempt). Requests need not be put in writing; refer to staff for inquiries. Requests need not be specific; yet, responses must be made within a reasonable period of time.</p> <p>JM: Since correspondence is subject to inspection, inquired if members should put such on a separate disk.</p> <p>RT: Will ask his supervisor about this.</p> <p>ET: He has had to put public records requests in writing and has been charged for them.</p> <p>RT: The County does not charge, unless it is a huge amount of material. Other municipalities may charge. No requests have to be in writing.</p>
BPAC WORKSHOP	<p>- TS: <i>The initial concept attempts to explain the planning process to the public. Various representatives from all the departments/agencies would explain the steps it takes to develop projects/programs/policies impacting non-motorized transportation. It would include the LRP/TIP, as well as procedures to change what has been planned. He does not want it to be an envisioning nor complaints workshop. These presentations have to be in layman's terms and easily-understood graphics. The general community would be invited; yet, focus would be for all bicycle/pedestrian-oriented groups to attend.</i></p> <p>ET: Agrees that many people, himself included, don't know how projects are developed.</p> <p>TS: He is hoping to avoid discussions on any particular project. The public has to be taught what the acronyms stand for, and how the system works. This helps them maintain accurate dialog with the hosts as they go to public meetings; as well as to understand how important it is to attend those meetings. Perhaps this workshop would be a forefront for other workshops that delve into project development.</p> <p>ET: A main focus could be where the funds come from and how they are allocated.</p> <p>TS: Disagrees. It is important to explain how projects are developed, as well as (if necessary) how to alter them to include non-motorized facilities afterwards.</p> <p>DH: This terminology for this process is known as "from concept to concrete".</p> <p>TS: The Bike Miami group has become more pro-active. At their last meeting, some questions/answers lacked knowledge of the processes that the County abides by. Would market it: "Come and Learn How to Affect Change for a Bicycle Facility".</p> <p>JH: Likes the idea; however, believes only ten people would attend.</p> <p>TS: If those ten people are educated, and they educate ten others, changes could happen.</p> <p>DH: Doubts that this subject would draw many people on its own. Suggested building momentum from the Bike Safety Town Hall meeting and recent others by providing a safety perspective. This would help develop safety projects, which takes coordination between various public groups and the government.</p> <p>SK: Believes more of the general public (not just bike clubs) would attend if the meeting promised a variety of activities. Maps are a big draw.</p> <p>TS: Agrees; but, that would be another workshop. It is fine to distribute items at this workshop; but, it needs to be focused upon the process and how to affect change.</p>

	<p>SK: Implying that attending the workshop would empower citizens to achieve bike paths in their neighborhoods is overreaching.</p> <p>TS: Believes the public needs this education. Most people are not riding erratically; and, they can get safety education. His focus is an issue that isn't being addressed.</p> <p>ET: <i>The slogan should be short and concise. Use an example of how a path was built.</i></p> <p>TS: At least the correct information will be provided, guiding people on a route to take. The process doesn't have to be complex or daunting. Basic steps for moving a project along, rather than every step is fine. An acronym list will help people speak the same vernacular when dealing with public agencies. If it takes a year to develop the workshop curriculum, it will still be vital and relevant information. By BPAC hosting this event, it raises public awareness that there is a venue for non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>GR: <i>Agrees a big focus should be put on where funds come and how they are allocated.</i></p> <p>DH: The <u>Bicycle Facilities Master Plan</u> is due for an update. As in the past workshops and other outreach efforts are part of the process; this could be part of that effort.</p> <p>TS: Believes that effort would lessen the impact of learning the planning process. Participants would believe that, after the envisioning sessions, they have contributed to the process and may become apathetic in ensuring those visions become reality. The master planning process takes several sessions; he would like the procedures workshop to be comprehensible in a few hours. <i>Requested DH to begin working on this project, as well as to include suggestions of the workshop format for the next BPAC meeting.</i> This would give an indication of how long it will take to develop the curriculum.</p>
PUBLIC WORKS UPDATES	<p>- JC: Rickenbacker Cswy. improvements are underway. The 2nd phase is designed, and funds are secured. <i>During the 3rd phase hand rails on all bridges will be installed. The transition to Brickell Av. will be leveled as much as possible. When finalized, bike lane markings will be installed from the toll booth to Sundays restaurant.</i> This links into the existing bike lanes, as well as Crandon Blvd's. (bike lanes) redesign,. The SW 48 St. bike lane project has been modified by Comm. Souto; <i>parts of the facility will only be "Share the Road" signage.</i> Maintenance responsibilities are being discussed by high-level Directors, as well as a Safe Routes to Parks proposal.</p> <p>ET: <i>Requested to review maintenance documentation at the next meeting; so that the BPAC can make a formal recommendation before it is included into the budget.</i></p> <p>JC: <i>A lot material ET provided previously has been included in this budgetary submittal.</i></p> <p>DH: Although maintenance was intended to be a monthly item, time limitations (specifically the Ethics Training) caused its removal this month.</p> <p>GR: Inquired about the Venetian Cswy. bike lane project.</p> <p>JC: Currently, the Venetian Cswy. is under redesign. The bridges have structural faults.</p> <p>GR: At the last meeting, the engineer said the bridge loads will be increased.</p> <p>JC: Either way, M-DPW staff is currently busy on Regional Transportation Commission projects and Mayors' List projects, (about 25 projects).</p> <p>GR: The lines are already there; all that's need are bicycle symbols.</p> <p>JC: There are engineering issues to address. <i>Striping at the toll booth will be remilled. RTC projects are supposed to be finished by the end of September.</i> It wouldn't be fiscally responsible to add bike symbols to the Venetian Cswy., then rip everything up when the redesign is ready for medians and lighting installations. <i>He will check the timeline with M-DPW staff.</i> The Mayor's List are county-wide, quick fixes; such as roundabouts, traffic signal modifications, and turn lanes. One of the Miami Beach projects (17 St. & Alton Rd. turn lane) was taken out because of logistical problems. <i>If there is a project, which is already under design or ready for construction, it can replace it.</i></p>

BISCAYNE/ EVERGLADES GREENWAY	-	<i>Note: Due to mechanical failure portions of this discussion are inaudible.</i> DH: A workshop will be held soon to take public input.
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES WORKSHOP	-	DH: (Handing-out copies of the flyer) <i>The workshop will be held on July 21st at the MDC – Wolfson Campus.</i> It is a follow-up to last year's workshop, with the same format. Dan Burden & Bill Hattaway provide ideas and concepts to make the existing transportation system more functional/friendly. It provides BPAC members perspectives on what can be accomplished relatively easily. <i>The Chairman will make introductions.</i> In addition, a Miami <i>Herald</i> reporter has expressed a desire to interview him.
MISCEL- LANEOUS	-	<p>♦ ET: <i>The South Dade Trail is to be completed by September 2007. The trail is extending south of US-1 to Krome Av.</i></p> <p>♦ BB: Had noticed that the CTAC meets in the Commission Chambers and their meetings are televised. Inquired if the same opportunities could be granted to the BPAC. This would be a great outreach forum. ET: If nothing more, <i>the workshop could be done there.</i> GR: Inquired as to the policy for a monthly broadcast. DH: Unsure. <i>Will research this issue.</i> JH: Considers Chambers' meetings impersonal and hard to hear the speakers. TS: <i>Requested to hold-off on discussions until DH reports back next month.</i></p> <p>♦ BB: The BPAC was hoping to have periodic MIC updates. TS: These should not be monthly; rather, <i>DH should notify the BPAC when significant updates are available.</i> BB: It's been 3 months. Their consultant went to Millennium Park in Chicago and was impressed by the bicycle accommodations there. JM: Grapeland Hts. Park is being redeveloped. This is a good opportunity to ensure a non-motorized connection to the MIC via NW 37 Av., which links to a bikeway along NW 14 St. NW 37 Av. is the only corridor from the south to arrive at the MIC, since LeJeune Rd. was ignored as a b/p connection. <i>The consultant could make a presentation.</i></p> <p>♦ GR: Requested the BPAC will inquire to the City of Miami Beach, reminding them of their promise to perform a bicycle count survey, as well as provide an update on their Bicycle Plan.</p> <p>♦ DH: <i>The next BPAC meeting will be August 23, 2006.</i> ET: <i>Would like to have a presentation on the M-Path connection to the So. Dade Trl. There is \$925,000 allocated this year; and, \$1.75 million for next fiscal year.</i> It's been a year since the BPAC hear a presentation. TS: Suggested ET to request information directly, if he can't wait a couple of months. DH: They are only now beginning design, so this may be premature.</p>

- *The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.*